



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,033	07/10/2001	Jeffrey Boulter	85804-019501 (01-9774)	9894
32361	7590	10/11/2005	EXAMINER	
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP MET LIFE BUILDING 200 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10166			LEZAK, ARRIENNE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,033

Applicant(s)

BOULTER ET AL.

Examiner

Arrienne M. Lezak

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/07/01, 01/21/03, 10/24/03, 04/14/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 12 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Examiner finds the wording "rating an artist in approximately the top one third of a possible rating spectrum" to be indefinite, and as such, require amendment. For examination purposes, Examiner will substitute the claim language of Claims 13 & 21 which indicate "rating an artist 70 in a scale of 1-100".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent US 6,192,340 B1 to Abecassis in view of US Patent 5,926,207 to Vaughan. Examiner further includes the teachings of MusicMatch Jukebox and RealJukebox as

Art Unit: 2143

incorporated within the Abecassis patent, (Abecassis – Col. 4, lines 30-65), and as taught by the non-patent literature provided with this office action.

5. Regarding Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-17, 19-25, 27-31, 33-37, 39 & 41, Abecassis discloses a system, method and computer readable medium for providing transmission of a data stream according to preferences of a community, (Abstract; Col. 4, lines 30-65; & Col. 5, lines 1-19), the steps comprising:

- providing a first community, said first community being self-defining by means of shared preferences, (Col. 2, lines 1-67; Col. 3, lines 1-64; Col. 17, lines 45-67; & Col. 18), said first community expressing first preferences regarding content in first data streams arising from a first music-related database including songs and/or music videos, (Col. 2, lines 36-67; Col. 3, lines 1-22; Col. 5, lines 20-24; Col. 15, lines 20-62; Col. 16, lines 47-67), (Examiner notes that the use of “channels” or “stations” was well-known at the time of invention by Applicant, as used by both RealJukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox. Additionally, the creation of personal virtual radio stations was also well-known as taught by the Lumelsky '672 art not relied upon, noted herein below);
- determining characteristics of said first preferences with regard to said first data streams to provide determined characteristics, (Col. 15, lines 27-67 & Col. 16, lines 47-60);
- receiving preferences from a first user, (per pending Claims 15 & 22) (Col. 16, lines 19-21);

Art Unit: 2143

- biasing an individual data stream arising from said first music-related database according to said determined characteristics and according to said preferences of said first user so that said individual data stream is biased for positive first preferences of said first community and biased against negative first preferences of said first community, (per pending Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 30 & 36), and so that said individual data stream is biased according to said preferences of said first user, (per pending Claims 15 & 22), (Col. 17, lines 46-67 & Col. 18);
- transmitting said individual data stream to said first user, including content highly rated by said first user according to said preferences of said first user, (per pending Claims 15 & 22), said individual data stream transmitted on a voluntary or selectable basis to allow said first user to receive said individual data stream on a voluntary or selectable basis, (per pending Claims 5, 11, 19, 27, 33 & 39), (Col. 17, lines 66-67 & Col. 18, lines 1-45); and
- said individual data stream has more content that said community likes and less content that said community dislikes without resort to analysis of said content in said data stream and wherein said first user receives content rated highly by said user, (Col. 17, lines 66-67 & Col. 18, lines 1-45), (Examiner notes that the preference indication functionality clearly and obviously provides for preferred content. Additionally, once preferences are indicated, the radio-on-demand functionality is designed

to automatically produce a continuous playing of highly rated audio responsive to pre-established preferences without user intervention/analysis.)

6. Thus, Examiner notes that Abecassis in light of MusicMatch Jukebox and RealJukebox teaches a Radio-on-demand functionality with numerous user-selectable radio stations in addition to the ability to set user preferences and transmit user-preferred programming wherein any number of users would obviously choose from the available radio-on-demand stations, thus forming a community of individuals with similar musical preferences. Additionally, Examiner notes that sub-categories clearly and obviously exist within the channel/station preferences, (i.e.: classical category, all-mozart channel sub-category), (Abecassis – Col. 15, lines 27-44).

7. That noted, a category obviously reads upon providing a second community, said second community expressing second preferences regarding content in second data streams arising from said first music-related database wherein anyone choosing said category as a preference causes the evaluation of said second preferences of said second community.

8. Additionally, all persons choosing the same sub-category would clearly and obviously read upon determining said first community from said second community by means of said second preferences with members of said first community having a first preference in common, so that said first community arises from a larger second community, said first community determined by having a first preference in common, (per pending Claims 3, 9, 17, 25, 31 & 37);

9. Finally, Abecassis further teaches the analysis of the requirements of a plurality of users, to allocate data that more closely matches the interests of the users, (Abecassis – Col. 17, lines 46-49), wherein repeated analysis of user preferences will clearly and obviously re-establish said first community, re-establish said expressed preferences, and re-bias said individual data stream, enabling both said first community and said determined characteristics to change over time according to, respectively, said second expressed preferences of said second community and said first expressed preferences of said first community, (per pending Claims 7, 14, 22, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35 & 41). Examiner further notes that repeated analysis of user preferences would obviously occur each time a user uses the radio-on-demand, as further noted by the “listening” functionality, (Abecassis – Col. 18, lines 55-67).

10. Thus, though Examiner finds that Abecassis clearly and obviously reads upon Applicant's claims language, Examiner notes that the specific notation of categories/2nd communities and sub-categories/1st communities is not enumerated, and therefore Examiner provides the Vaughan reference. Vaughan teaches a database containing a master list of broadcast channels selectively programmable to define broadcast channel behavior independently of other broadcast channels, (Col. 2, lines 5-44 & Claims 1-28), wherein a user can further designate sub-lists comprising a filtering functionality. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to combine the category/sub-category of Vaughan with the Abecassis user-preference transmission method as Abecassis clearly teaches the analysis of the interests of a plurality of users to more closely match said users interests, (Abecassis –

Art Unit: 2143

Col. 17, lines 46-49), and Vaughan clearly teaches the need to limit desired functionalities such that they are individually customized and associated with a particular broadcast channel per user(s) preference, (Vaughan – Col. 1, lines 61-67 & Col. 2, lines 1-2). In other words, the combination further defines user interest and preference as it pertains to broadcast data. Thus, Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-17, 19-25, 27-31, 33-37, 39 & 41 are found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Abecassis, (Real Jukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox) and Vaughan.

11. Regarding Claims 4, 10, 18, 26, 32 & 38, the combined teachings of Abecassis, (Real Jukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox) and Vaughan are relied upon as noted herein above. Abecassis further teaches biasing said individual data stream so that it complies with the DMCA. Abecassis discloses a method, system and interface for broadcasting data streams through the Internet wherein conformance with applicable copyright law is well-known and thus inherently applies to all transmitted data streams wherever and whenever they occur, to whomever they are displayed and for whatever they contain. Thus, as Abecassis teaches the transmission of content generally, copyright law is inherently relevant and applicable to the same. Thus, Claims 4, 10, 18, 26, 32 & 38 are found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Abecassis, (Real Jukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox) and Vaughan.

12. Regarding Claims 40 & 42, the combined teachings of Abecassis, (Real Jukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox) and Vaughan are relied upon as noted herein above. Abecassis further teaches said server being in said first location and at least one of said users being in a second location, said second location being a different country than

Art Unit: 2143

said first location, (Col. 5, lines 20-24). Examiner notes that remote sources obviously include any source remote to the user, including, but not limited to a source in another country. Specifically, as Abecassis, RealJukebox and Musicmatch Jukebox teach radio-on-demand, said radio-on-demand would obviously include broadcast transmissions from any broadcasting source, which sources are well-known to be both national and international. Thus, Claims 40 & 42 are found to be unpatentable over the combined teachings of Abecassis, (Real Jukebox and MusicMatch Jukebox) and Vaughan.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent US 6,246,672 B1 to Lumelsky;

Real Networks Non-Patent Literature;

MusicMatch Non-Patent Literature.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (571)-272-3916. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571)-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arrienne M. Lezak
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

AML



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100